arXiv:1611.06726v1 [math.FA] 21 Nov 2016

ON A QUESTION OF N. TH. VAROPOULOS

RAJEEV GUPTA AND SAMYA KUMAR RAY

Abstract. The Varopoulos inequality $K_G^{\mathbb{C}} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n) \leq 2K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$, where $K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the complex Grothendieck constant and $C_2(n) = \sup\left\{\|p(\boldsymbol{T})\| : \|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty} \leq 1, \|\boldsymbol{T}\|_\infty \leq 1\right\}$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is due to Varopoulos. Here the supremum is taken over all commuting n - tuples $\boldsymbol{T} := (T_1, \ldots, T_n)$ of contractions and all complex polynomials p in n variables of degree at most 2 and of supremum norm at most 1 over the polydisc. We show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n) \geq 1.118K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$, which in turn proves that the factor 2 on the right hand side of Varopoulos inequality can not be removed.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{C}[Z_1, \ldots, Z_n]$ denote the set of all complex polynomials in n variables. The von Neumann inequality [vN51] states that $\|p(T)\| \leq \|p\|_{\mathbb{D},\infty}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{C}[Z]$ and for every contraction T on a complex Hilbert space, where for any nonempty set X and $f : X \to \mathbb{C}$, we define

$$\|f\|_{X,\infty} = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in X\}.$$

An analogous inequality for any pair of commuting contractions T_1, T_2, namely, $\|p(T_1, T_2)\| \leq \|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^2,\infty}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{C}[Z_1, Z_2]$, holds true due to Ando [And63]. Varopoulos [Var74] constructed examples showing that a generalization of this inequality to three variables fails. He along with Kaijser and simultaneously Crabb and Davie [CD75] also produced an explicit example of three commuting contractions T_1, T_2, T_3 and a polynomial p with the property $\|p(T_1, T_2, T_3)\| > \|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^3,\infty}$. For a fixed k define the quantity (see [Var76] and [Pis01, Page 24]):

$$C_k(n) = \sup\left\{\|p(\boldsymbol{T})\| : \|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty} \leq 1, p \in \mathbb{C}[Z_1, \ldots, Z_n] \text{ is of degree at most } k, \|\boldsymbol{T}\|_\infty \leq 1\right\}$$

and let $C(n)$ denote the quantity $\lim_{k\to\infty} C_k(n)$, where $\|\boldsymbol{T}\|_\infty = \max\left\{\|T_1\|, \ldots, \|T_n\|\right\}$ for a commuting tuple of contractions $\boldsymbol{T} = (T_1, \ldots, T_n)$.

The counterexample to von Neumann inequality in three variables, due to Varopoulos and Kaijser [Var74], involves a (explicit) homogeneous polynomial of degree 2 therefore $C_2(3) > 1$. Also due to [vN51] and [And63], the quantities $C(1) = 1$ and $C(2) = 1$ respectively. In another paper [Var76], Varopoulos shows that

$$K_G^{\mathbb{C}} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n) \leq 2K_G^{\mathbb{C}}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the complex Grothendieck constant defined below. Since the constant $K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is stictly bigger than 1 therefore the inequality (1.1) is yet another way to see that von Neumann inequality fails eventually. We refer the inequalty (1.1) as `Varopoulos inequality`. Varopoulos had asked in his paper [Var76] whether one can get rid of the factor 2 appearing on the right hand side of (1.1). Very recentely, by giving a bound on $\|D^2(f)\|_{\ell^\infty(n)\to\ell^1(n)}$, for any holomorphic map $f : \mathbb{D}^n \to \mathbb{D}$, Rajeev [Gupar] has improved the inequality (1.1) in the following form:

$$K_G^{\mathbb{C}} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n) \leq \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{4} K_G^{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{1.2}$$

Key words and phrases. Complex Grothendieck constant, von Neumann Inequality, Varopoulos Operator, Positive Grothedieck constant.

The first named author is supported by Science and Engineering Research Board, DST, Government of India.

The second named author is supported by Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, MHRD, Government of India.

However, in this paper, we answer the question of Varopoulos in negative by improving the lower bound by the factor 1.118 in the inequality (1.1) i.e we prove that $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n) \geq 1.118 K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Definition 1.1 (Grothendieck Constant)**.** Suppose $A := \left((a_{jk})\right)_{n\times n}$ is a complex (real) array satisfying

$$\left|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk} s_j t_k\right| \leq \max\left\{|s_j||t_k| : 1 \leq j,k \leq n\right\}, \tag{1.3}$$

where s_j, t_k are complex (real) numbers. Then there exists $K > 0$ such that for any choice of sequence of vectors $(x_j)_1^n$, $(y_k)_1^n$ in a complex (real) Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$, we have

$$\left|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk}\langle x_j, y_k\rangle\right| \leq K \max\left\{\|x_j\|\|y_k\| : 1 \leq j,k \leq n\right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

It can be shown that there is a finite K satisfying inequality (1.4) and independent of n and $\left((a_{jk})\right)$; the least such constant is denoted by K_G and called Grothendieck constant. Note that the definition of K_G depends only on the underlying field. When it is the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers, this constant is called the complex Grothendieck constant and is denoted by $K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$. It is known that $1.338 < K_G^{\mathbb{C}} \leq 1.4049$. For this and more, we refer the reader to [Pis12].

Definition 1.2 (Positive Grothendieck Constant)**.** Suppose $A := \left((a_{jk})\right)_{n\times n}$ is a complex (real) non-negative definite array satisfying (1.3) then there exists $K > 0$, independent of n and A, such that (1.4) holds. The least such constant is denoted by $K_G^+(\mathbb{C})$ ($K_G^+(\mathbb{R})$) and called Complex (Real) Positive Grothendieck constant. The values of $K_G^+(\mathbb{C})$ and $K_G^+(\mathbb{R})$ are $4/\pi$ and $\pi/2$ respectively, see [Pis12].

For any $n \times n$ complex matrix $A := \left((a_{ij})\right)$, define p_A, two degree homogeneous polynomial, by $p_A(z_1,\ldots,z_n) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} z_i z_j$. Suppose p is the following polynomial of degree at most 2 in n variables

$$p(z_1,\ldots,z_n) = a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j z_j + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk} z_j z_k$$

with $a_{jk} = a_{kj}$ (can be assumed without loss of generality) for all $j,k = 1,\ldots,n$. Corresponding to p, one can define the following $(n+1)\times(n+1)$ symmetric complex matrix

$$A(p) = \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & \frac{1}{2}a_1 & \frac{1}{2}a_2 & \cdots & \frac{1}{2}a_n \\ \frac{1}{2}a_1 & a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ \frac{1}{2}a_2 & a_{12} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{2}a_n & a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.5}$$

It can be seen that $\|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty} = \|p_{A(p)}\|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1},\infty}$. We define the following quantity:

$$C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(n) = \sup\left\{\|p_A(\boldsymbol{T})\| : A \text{ is a } n\times n \text{ non-negative definite real matrix and } \|\boldsymbol{T}\|_\infty \leq 1\right\}$$

and let $C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}$ denote the quantity $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(n)$. It is clear from the definitions that $C_2(n) \geq C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(n)$ for each n. In this paper, we prove that $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(n) = \pi/2$. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n) \geq \pi/2 \geq 1.118 K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space and $\{e_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a set of orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{H}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{H}$, define $x^\sharp : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $x^\sharp(y) = \sum_j x_j y_j$, where $x = \sum_j x_j e_j$ and $y = \sum_j y_j e_j$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{H}$, we set $\left[x^\sharp, y\right] = x^\sharp(y)$. Let $\mathbb{H}^\sharp := \left\{x^\sharp : x \in \mathbb{H}\right\}$. Let $\mathbb{H}^\sharp$ be equipped with the operator

norm. Since the map $\phi : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{H}^\sharp$ defined by $\phi(x) = x^\sharp$ is a linear onto isometry, therefore $\mathbb{H}^\sharp$ is linearly (as opposed to the usual anti-linear identification) isometrically isomorphic to $\mathbb{H}$. The following definition can also be found in [Gup15].

Definition 1.3 (Varopoulos Operator)**.** Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space. For $x, y \in \mathbb{H}$, define $T_{x,y} : \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ by

$$T_{x,y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x^\sharp & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The operator $T_{x,y}$ will be called Varopoulos operator corresponding to the pair of vectors x, y. If $x = y$ then T_{xy} will simply be denoted by T_x.

2. Improvement of the Lower Bound in Varopoulos Inequalty

The following theorem is from [Var76] and the presented proof is hinted in [Gupar].

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose p is a polynomial of degree at most 2 in n variables and $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is a tuple of commuting contractions on a Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$. Then*

$$\|p(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq 2K_G^{\mathbb{C}} \|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^n, \infty},$$

where $K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the complex Grothendieck constant.

Proof. Let

$$p(z_1, \dots, z_n) = a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j z_j + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk} z_j z_k.$$

For $x, y \in \mathbb{H}$ arbitrary vectors of norm at most 1, we have

$$|\langle p(T_1, \dots, T_n)x, y\rangle| = \Big|a_0\langle x, y\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle a_j T_j x, y\rangle + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle a_{jk} T_j x, T_k^* y\rangle\Big|.$$

Consider the matrix $A(p)$, corresponding to p, as defined in (1.5). Then $p_{A(p)}$, corresponding homogeneous polynomial of degree 2 in $n+1$ variables, is defined by

$$p_{A(p)}(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_n) = a_0 z_0^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j z_j z_0 + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk} z_j z_k.$$

We know that $\|p_{A(p)}\|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}, \infty} = \|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^n, \infty}$. Denote $v_0 = x, v_j = T_j x$ and $w_0 = y, w_j = T_j^* y$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} a(p)_{jk} \langle v_j, w_k\rangle = a_0\langle x, y\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle a_j T_j x, y\rangle + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle a_{jk} T_j x, T_k^* y\rangle,$$

where $a(p)_{jk}$ is the (j,k) entry in $A(p)$. From the definition of the complex Grothendieck constant, we get

$$\Big|\sum_{j=0}^{n} a(p)_{jk} \langle v_j, w_k\rangle\Big| \leq K_G^{\mathbb{C}} \|A(p)\|_{\ell^\infty(n+1) \to \ell^1(n+1)}.$$

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a(p)_{jk} z_j w_k = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a(p)_{jk} \frac{(z_j w_k + z_k w_j)}{2} = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a(p)_{jk} \frac{(z_j + w_j)(z_k + w_k) - (z_j - w_j)(z_k - w_k))}{4}.$$

Since $|z_j + w_j| \leq 2$ and $|z_j - w_j| \leq 2$ for $|z_j| \leq 1$ and $|w_j| \leq 1$, one gets

$$\sup_{|z_j|\leq 1, |w_k|\leq 1} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a(p)_{jk} z_j w_k \Big| \leq 2\|p\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty}.$$

Hence the theorem. □

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $A = ((a_{jk}))$ is a $n \times n$ symmetric matrix. Then*

$$\sup_{\substack{\|x_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{C}}(m)}\leq 1 \\ m\in\mathbb{N}}} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk}\langle x_j, x_k\rangle = \sup_{\substack{\|R_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{R}}(m)}\leq 1 \\ m\in\mathbb{N}}} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk}\langle R_j, R_k\rangle.$$

Proof. Fix $x_j \in \mathbb{C}^m$ with $\|x_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{C}}(m)} \leq 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Define $R_j = \big(\frac{x_j+\overline{x}_j}{2}, i\frac{x_j-\overline{x}_j}{2}\big)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle R_j, R_k\rangle &= \sum_{p=1}^{m} \Big(\frac{x_j^{(p)} + \overline{x_j^{(p)}}}{2}\Big)\Big(\frac{x_k^{(p)} + \overline{x_k^{(p)}}}{2}\Big) + i^2 \sum_{p=1}^{m} \Big(\frac{x_j^{(p)} - \overline{x_j^{(p)}}}{2}\Big)\Big(\frac{x_k^{(p)} - \overline{x_k^{(p)}}}{2}\Big) \\
&= \sum_{p=1}^{m} (\Re x_j^{(p)} \Re x_k^{(p)} + \Im x_j^{(p)} \Im x_k^{(p)}) \\
&= \Re\Big(\sum_{p=1}^{m} x_j^{(p)} \overline{x_j^{(p)}}\Big) \\
&= \frac{\langle x_j, x_k\rangle + \langle x_k, x_j\rangle}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Re z$ and $\Im z$ denote the real and imaginary part of z respectively. In particular, $\|R_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{R}}(2m)} = \|x_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{C}}(m)}$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Since A is a symmetric matrix therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum a_{jk}\langle x_j, x_k\rangle &= \sum a_{jk}\langle x_k, x_j\rangle \\
&= \sum a_{jk} \frac{\langle x_j, x_k\rangle + \langle x_k, x_j\rangle}{2} \\
&= \sum a_{jk}\langle R_j, R_k\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\sup_{\|x_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{C}}(m)}\leq 1} \sum a_{jk}\langle x_j, x_k\rangle = \sup_{\|R_j\|_{\ell^2_{\mathbb{R}}(2m)}\leq 1} \sum a_{jk}\langle R_j, R_k\rangle$$

for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and symmetric matrix A. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $A = (a_{jk})$ is a non-negative definite $n \times n$ matrix. Then*

$$\sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk} z_j z_k \Big| = \sup_{s_j=\pm 1} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a_{jk} s_j s_k.$$

Proof. Suppose $A = ((a_{jk}))$ is a $n \times n$ complex non-negative definite matrix. Then there exists $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\langle v_j, v_k\rangle = a_{jk}$ for each $j, k = 1, \ldots, n$. Define $V_j = (\frac{v_j+\overline{v}_j}{2}, i\frac{v_j-\overline{v}_j}{2})$ as in the Lemma 2.2. Denote the matrix $((\langle V_j, V_k\rangle))$ by $A_{\mathbb{R}}$. As in Lemma 2.2, one gets the equality $\langle V_j, V_k\rangle = \frac{\langle v_j,v_k\rangle+\langle v_k,v_j\rangle}{2}$. Furthermore,

$$\sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle V_j, V_k\rangle z_j z_k \Big| = \sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle v_j, v_k\rangle z_j z_k \Big|$$

and thus $\|p_{A_{\mathbb{R}}}\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty} = \|p_A\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty}$. Therefore, it suffices to work with real non-negative definite matrix only.

Let $z_1^0, \ldots, z_n^0$ be such that

$$\sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k \Big| = \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j^0 z_k^0 \Big| = re^{i\phi}(say).$$

Define $\tilde{z}_j = e^{-i\phi/2} z_j^0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Then, we have the following

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} \tilde{z}_j \tilde{z}_k = \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j^0 z_k^0 \Big|.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} \tilde{z}_j \tilde{z}_k + \overline{\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} \tilde{z}_j \tilde{z}_k} = 2 \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j^0 z_k^0 \Big|$$

and hence one concludes the following identity

$$\sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k + \overline{\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k} \Big| = 2 \sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k \Big|.$$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k + \overline{\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k} \Big| &= \sup_{\theta_j\in\mathbb{R}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} cos(\theta_j + \theta_k) \Big| \\
&= \sup_{\theta_j\in\mathbb{R}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} (cos\theta_j cos\theta_k - sin\theta_j sin\theta_k) \Big| \\
&= \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} cos\delta_j cos\delta_k - \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} sin\delta_j sin\delta_k \\
&\leq \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} cos\delta_j cos\delta_k \ \text{(Since } A \text{ is nnd)} \\
&\leq \sup_{s_j=\pm 1} \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} s_j s_k,
\end{aligned}$$

where δ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are chosen such that $\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} cos(\theta_j + \theta_k)$ is positive and attains maximum in modulus at $\theta_j = \delta_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus we get the identity

$$\sup_{z_j\in\mathbb{T}} \Big| \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} z_j z_k \Big| = \sup_{s_j=\pm 1} \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} s_j s_k.$$

This proves the claim. □

Remark 2.4. For any matrix A, one can associate $\frac{A+A^{\mathrm{t}}}{2}$, a symmetric matrix, which has the following property $\|p_A\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty} = \|p_{\frac{A+A^{\mathrm{t}}}{2}}\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty}$. Thus previous lemma holds true for all matrices A for which $A + A^{\mathrm{t}}$ is non-negative definite or negative definite.

Recentely, there have been attempts for finiding maximum modulus of polynomials over poly-disc [Gre99, Che09]. Their methods mainly rely on Stečkin's lemma. However, using the Lemma 2.3 and semidefinite programming (see [AN06]), one can find maximum modulus for degree two

polynomials which are coming from the matrices A with the property that $A+A^{\mathrm{t}}$ is non-negative definite or negative definite.

We now prove the main theorem as a corollary of above lemmas.

Theorem 2.5. $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}} = \pi/2$.

Proof. Suppose A a is $n\times n$ real non-negative definte matrix and $(T_1,\dots,T_n)$ is a commuting tuple of contractions on a complex Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$. Fix $x,y\in\mathbb{H}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\|x\|\leq 1,\|y\|\leq 1}\langle p_A(T_1,\dots,T_n)x,y\rangle &= \sup_{\|x\|\leq 1,\|y\|\leq 1}\left|a_{jk}\langle T_jx,T_k^*y\rangle\right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|x_j\|\leq 1}\left|a_{jk}\langle x_j,x_k\rangle\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\sup_{\substack{A\neq 0\\ A \text{ is nnd}}}\frac{\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|_\infty\leq 1}\|p_A(T_1,\dots,T_n)\|}{\|p_A\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty}} \leq \sup_{\substack{A\neq 0\\ A \text{ is nnd}}}\frac{\sup_{\|x_j\|\leq 1}\left|\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}\langle x_j,x_k\rangle\right|}{\|A\|_{\ell^\infty_{\mathbb{R}}(n)\to\ell^1_{\mathbb{R}}(n)}} \tag{2.1}$$

Fix a $n\times n$ real non-negative definite matrix A and $x_j\in\mathbb{C}^m$ for some m and $j=1,\dots,n$. Define $X_j=(\frac{x_j+\overline{x}_j}{2}, i\frac{x_j-\overline{x}_j}{2})$ for $j=1,\dots,n$. Define Varopoulos operator T_j corresponding to X_j for $j=1,\dots,n$. Then

$$p_A(T_1,\dots,T_n)=\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}\langle X_j,X_k\rangle=\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}\langle x_j,x_k\rangle$$

Using Lemma 2.3 once again we get

$$\sup_{\substack{A\neq 0\\ A \text{ is nnd}}}\frac{\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|_\infty\leq 1}\|p_A(T_1,\dots,T_n)\|}{\|p_A\|_{\mathbb{D}^n,\infty}} \geq \sup_{\substack{A\neq 0\\ A \text{ is nnd}}}\frac{\sup_{\|x_j\|\leq 1}\left|\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}\langle x_j,x_k\rangle\right|}{\|A\|_{\ell^\infty_{\mathbb{R}}(n)\to\ell^1_{\mathbb{R}}(n)}}$$

and hence in (2.1) we get the equality. Also the right hand side of (2.1) is $\pi/2$ whereas the left hand side is $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}$. This proves the theorem. □

The above theorem shows that in Varopoulos inequality the factor 2 can be removed, once we restrict ourselves to the set of homogeneous polynomials of degree 2 coming from the real non-negative definite matrices. Also the constant $K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is replaced by $K_G^+(\mathbb{R})$. The next corollary shows that the factor 2 can not be removed, in general, from the Varopoulos inequality.

Corollary 2.6. $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n)\geq 1.118K_G^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Proof. We know that $C_2(n)\geq C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(n)$ for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ therefore

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2(n)\geq\lim_{n\to\infty} C_2^{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(n)=\pi/2=1.118*1.4049\geq 1.118*K_G^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Hence the corollary. □

Acknowledgement: We are very grateful to Prof. Gadadhar Misra and Prof. Gilles Pisier for several fruitful discussions and suggestions. The authors also express their sincere gratitude to Prof. Sameer Chavan and Prof. Parasar Mohanty for their constant support.

References

[AN06] N. Alon and A. Naor, *Approximating the cut-norm via Grothendieck's inequality*, SIAM J. Comput. **35** (2006), no. 4, 787–803 (electronic). MR 2203567

[And63] T. Andô, *On a pair of commutative contractions*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **24** (1963), 88–90. MR 0155193 (27 #5132)

[CD75] M. J. Crabb and A. M. Davie, *von Neumann's inequality for Hilbert space operators*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **7** (1975), 49–50. MR 0365179

[Che09] G. Chevrotire, *Finding the maximum modulus of a polynomial on the polydisk using a generalization of Stečkin's lemma*, SIAM Undergraduate Research Online (2009), 71–80.

[Gre99] J. J. Green, *Calculating the maximum modulus of a polynomial using Stečkin's lemma*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **36** (1999), no. 4, 1022–1029 (electronic). MR 1694626

[Gup15] R. Gupta, *The Carathéodory-Fejér Interpolation Problems and the von-Neumann Inequality*, ArXiv e-prints (2015), 1508.07199.

[Gupar] R. Gupta, *An improvement on the bound for $c_2(n)$*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) (to appear).

[Pis01] G. Pisier, *Similarity problems and completely bounded maps*, expanded ed., Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1618, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Includes the solution to "The Halmos problem". MR 1818047 (2001m:47002)

[Pis12] ———, *Grothendieck's theorem, past and present*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **49** (2012), no. 2, 237–323. MR 2888168

[Var74] N. Th. Varopoulos, *On an inequality of von Neumann and an application of the metric theory of tensor products to operators theory*, J. Functional Analysis **16** (1974), 83–100. MR 0355642 (50 #8116)

[Var76] ———, *On a commuting family of contractions on a Hilbert space*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **21** (1976), no. 9, 1283–1285. MR 0430824 (55 #3829)

[vN51] J. von Neumann, *Eine Spektraltheorie für allgemeine Operatoren eines unitären Raumes*, Math. Nachr. **4** (1951), 258–281. MR 0043386 (13,254a)

Rajeev Gupta: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur-208016

E-mail address: rajeevg@math.iitk.ac.in

Samya Kumar Ray: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur-208016

E-mail address: samya@math.iitk.ac.in